

REMARKS

5 In response to the Examiner's Action mailed on May 20, 2004, claims 1 to 25 are amended. The applicant hereby respectfully requests that the patent application be reconsidered.

An item-by-item response to Examiner's objections or rejections is provided in the followings:

10 1. *Rejection of Claims under 35 USC §102*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C.102(e) as being anticipated by Drury et al (6,707,421).

15 In response to the rejections, claims 1-25 are amended. The amended claim 1 are directed to map retrieval that are different, not anticipated and non-obvious over Drury.

20 Specifically, in claim 1, the amended claim now directs to a method for retrieving a map from an Internet web-site comprising:

- 25 a) sending a telephone number for a destination location as a map request to said Internet web-site **wherein said map request is sent through an Internet Protocol with said telephone number provided in a sub-field of an universal resource locator (URL) identifying said Internet web-site;** and
b) receiving a map for said destination location from said Internet web site associated with said telephone number.

The amended claim 22 now directs to a network system that includes:

- 30 a) a geocentric server for receiving a numeric data input coded for a destination location as a map request through an Internet Protocol

November 22, 2004

with said numeric input provided in a sub-field of an universal resource locator (URL) identifying said geocentric server; and

- b) said geocentric server further includes a database-search enabling means for enabling a geocentric database search for determining a geographic position of said destination location associated with said numeric input.

The amended claims 1-25 are different and unrelated to Drury because the amended claims are directed to method and systems to get map through map requests sent through Internet Protocols with sub-filed providing the telephone number. Such process and system are not disclosed or suggested in Drury. Therefore, Drury would not anticipate the amended claims 1-25.

3. *Rejection of Claims under 35 USC §103*

The Examiner rejects claims 6-8, 10, 15, 17 and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being upatentable over Drury in view of Yacoby. According to the Examiner, Yacoby disclosed a normalized telephone number. It would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Yacoly and Drury et al, to devise an invention as disclosed in the rejected claims.

As discussed above, claims 1-25 are amended to point to the methods and systems for map retrieval of map for a destination location associated by a telephone number. As directed by the claims, the processes involve the use of the telephone number of coded number for determination of the address, or surrounding areas of a destination location and then the map is retrieved using the address or the identification of the surround areas of the destination location. The map requests are sent through Internet Protocols with sub-filed providing the telephone number. A combination of Drury and Yacoby would not make

November 22, 2004

the invention as directed by the claims as now amended.

For the amended claims, the Applicant requests that the rejection
for the amended claims be withdrawn.


5

With the amended claims and the reasons provided above, the
applicant hereby respectfully requests that Examiner's rejections under 35
35 USC § 102, and 35 USC § 103 be withdrawn and the present application
be allowed.

10

Respectfully submitted
Kehyeh Szutu

By



15

Bo-In Lin - Attorney, Registration No. 33,948
13445 Mandoli Drive, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
(650) 949-0418 (Tel), (650) 949-4118 (Fax)

November 22, 2004